arXiv:1512.02543v1 [stat.ML] 8 Dec 2015

Gibbs-type Indian buffet processes

Creighton Heaukulani* **and Daniel M. Roy†**

University of Cambridge
Cambridge, United Kingdom
e-mail: ckh28@cam.ac.uk

University of Toronto
Toronto, Canada
e-mail: droy@utstat.toronto.edu

Abstract: We investigate a class of feature allocation models that generalize the Indian buffet process and are parameterized by Gibbs-type random measures. Two existing classes are contained as special cases: the original two-parameter Indian buffet process, corresponding to the Dirichlet process, and the stable (or three-parameter) Indian buffet process, corresponding to the Pitman–Yor process. Asymptotic behavior of the Gibbs-type partitions, such as power laws holding for the number of latent clusters, translates into analogous characteristics for this class of Gibbs-type feature allocation models. Despite containing several different distinct subclasses, the properties of Gibbs-type partitions allow us to develop a black-box procedure for posterior inference within any subclass of models. Through numerical experiments, we compare and contrast a few of these subclasses and highlight the utility of varying power-law behaviors in the latent features.

Keywords and phrases: feature allocation, partition, combinatorial stochastic processes, completely random measure, Bayesian nonparametrics.

1. Introduction

Feature allocation models [3, 12] assume that data are grouped into a collection of possibly overlapping subsets, called *features*. The best known example is the *Indian buffet process* (IBP) [12, 15, 16], which has been successfully applied to a number of unsupervised clustering problems [17] in which the features represent overlapping clusters underlying the data. While the IBP provides a nonparametric distribution suited to learning an appropriate number of clusters from the data, additional modeling flexibility—like heavy-tailed (i.e., power law) behavior in the number of latent clusters—is desirable in many applications. Recent generalizations of the IBP addressing these needs parallel existing developments in the theory of random partitions [2, 46, 47]. Random feature allocations may be viewed as a generalization of random partitions (which are employed as models for non-overlapping clusters) where the subsets of the partition are allowed to overlap. In recent work, Roy [44] defines a broad class of random feature allocations called the *generalized Indian buffet process*, each member of which

*Research supported in part by the Stephen Thomas studentship at Queens' College, Cambridge, with funding also from the Cambridge Trusts.

†Research carried out in part while a research fellow of Emmanuel College, Cambridge, with funding also from a Newton International Fellowship through the Royal Society.

corresponds to the law of an exchangeable partition. In this article, we study the subclass corresponding to the random *Gibbs-type partitions* [14], which we call the *Gibbs-type Indian buffet process* or simply *Gibbs-type IBP*. The Gibbs-type IBP inherits many useful properties from the Gibbs-type partitions (which includes many of the partitioning models studied in the literature), and the special form of these models will allow us to develop practical black-box algorithms for simulation and posterior inference.

The class of exchangeable Gibbs-type partition laws is parameterized by a real $\alpha < 1$, called the *discount parameter*, and a triangular array of non-negative weights $\overrightarrow{V} := (V_{n,k} \colon n \geq k \geq 1)$, satisfying $V_{1,1} = 1$ and the forward recursive equations

$$V_{n,k} = (n - \alpha k)V_{n+1,k} + V_{n+1,k+1}, \qquad n \geq k \geq 1. \tag{1.1}$$

(In examples below, we will discuss several important subclasses. In each case, the weights themselves are determined by a finite set of parameters, which we will denote by Θ.) In order to define the corresponding class of Gibbs-type IBPs, additionally define the primitives

$$F^n_{\alpha,\Theta}(z_1, z_2) := \sum_{k=1}^{n} \frac{V_{n+z_1,k+z_2}}{\alpha^k} \mathscr{C}(n, k; \alpha), \qquad z_1, z_2 \geq 0, \tag{1.2}$$

for every $n \geq 1$, where $\mathscr{C}(n, k; \alpha)$ denotes the generalized factorial coefficient

$$\mathscr{C}(n, k; \alpha) := \frac{1}{k!} \sum_{i=0}^{k} (-1)^i \binom{k}{i} (-i\alpha)_n, \tag{1.3}$$

and $(a)_n := \Gamma(a + n)/\Gamma(a)$. Then the Gibbs-type IBP may be described as follows: Let $\gamma > 0$, and imagine a sequence of customers entering an Indian buffet restaurant.

- The first customer tries Poisson(γ) dishes from the buffet.
- For every $n \geq 1$, the $n + 1$-st customer
  - tries each previously tasted dish k independently with probability
    $$(S_{n,k} - \alpha)F^n_{\alpha,\Theta}(1, 0),$$
    where $S_{n,k}$ is the number among the first n customers that tried dish k;
  - and tries Poisson($\gamma F^n_{\alpha,\Theta}(1, 1)$) new dishes from the buffet.

Some subclasses of Gibbs-type IBPs have appeared in the literature, although they have not been understood in these terms. In particular, the *stable* (or *three-parameter*) IBP introduced by Teh and Görür [47] and further studied by Broderick et al. [2] is a Gibbs-type IBP corresponding to the class of Gibbs-type partitions whose weights $\overrightarrow{V}$ are given by

$$V_{n,k} = \frac{\prod_{\ell=1}^{k-1}(\theta + \ell\alpha)}{(\theta + 1)_{n-1}}, \qquad n \geq k \geq 1, \tag{1.4}$$

for some parameter θ satisfying

$$\begin{cases} \theta > -\alpha, & \text{when } \alpha \in [0,1), \\ \theta = m|\alpha| \text{ for some } m \in \{1,2,\dots\}, & \text{when } \alpha < 0. \end{cases} \tag{1.5}$$

This class of Gibbs-type partitions corresponds to the two-parameter Chinese Restaurant processes, i.e., the partitions of $\mathbb{N} := \{1,2,\dots\}$ induced by the pattern of ties in exchangeable sequences sampled from a Pitman–Yor process [38, 42]. For this subclass, we have $\Theta = \{\theta\}$ and the quantities $F^n_{\alpha,\Theta}(1,0)$ and $F^n_{\alpha,\Theta}(1,1)$ reduce to

$$F^n_{\alpha,\Theta}(1,0) = (\theta+n)^{-1} \quad \text{and} \quad F^n_{\alpha,\Theta}(1,1) = \frac{\Gamma(\theta+1)\Gamma(\theta+\alpha+n)}{\Gamma(\theta+n+1)\Gamma(\theta+\alpha)}, \tag{1.6}$$

respectively. For $\alpha = 0$ and $\theta > 0$, we obtain the two-parameter IBP [12]. For $\alpha = 0$ and $\theta = 1$, the corresponding Gibbs-type IBP is the (original) one-parameter IBP [15, 16]. In short, the three-parameter IBP is the feature allocation analogue to the two-parameter Chinese Restaurant process, and the two-parameter IBP is the analogue to the one-parameter Chinese Restaurant process.

In Section 2, we review the theory of exchangeable Gibbs-type partitions, focusing on a few important subclasses. In Section 3, we derive the Gibbs-type IBP from a construction with completely random measures. As an intermediate step, we define the *Gibbs-type beta process*, a completely random measure that generalizes the *beta process* defined by Hjort [19]. We present corresponding stick-breaking constructions for the Gibbs-type beta process that generalize similar representations in the literature for the beta and stable beta processes [2, 35–37, 47, 48]. While all of these constructions are special cases of the *generalized beta process* and corresponding *generalized IBP* defined by Roy [44], the special form of the Gibbs-type partitions will allow us to additionally derive practical algorithms for simulation and posterior inference with the Gibbs-type IBP.

Partitions with Gibbs-type structure exhibit many properties that are useful for applications. For example, when the so-called *discount parameter* α is in $(0,1)$, a Gibbs-type partition exhibits heavy-tailed (i.e., power law) behavior in the asymptotic distribution of the number of clusters induced by the partition [41]. Latent features in the stable IBP were shown to exhibit analogous power-law behavior [2, 47], and in Section 5.2 we show that these characteristics are in a sense inherited from the two-parameter CRP or, equivalently, the Pitman–Yor process (with $\alpha \in (0,1)$). More generally, our results show that the Gibbs-type IBP inherits these power-law properties for any such class of partitioning models. Similarly, when $\alpha < 0$, the Gibbs-type partitions correspond to models with a random but finite number of clusters, and in Section 5.3 we show that the Gibbs-type IBP in this case corresponds to models with a random but finite number of features.

Many computations of interest with Gibbs-type partitions, e.g., the expected number of blocks in the partition, are expressed only through the weights $\overrightarrow{V}$ and

the parameter α. Likewise, the primitives $F^n_{\alpha,\Theta}(z_1, z_2)$ in Eq. (1.2) only depend on these quantities, and in Section 6 we derive a black-box posterior inference procedure that only requires these primitives as input. Finally, in Section 7 we demonstrate some of the practical differences between a few subclasses of the Gibbs-type IBP in a Bayesian nonparametric latent feature model applied to synthetic data and the classic MNIST digits dataset.

2. Exchangeable Gibbs-type partitions

Let Π be a random partition of $\mathbb{N} := \{1, 2, \dots\}$ into disjoint subsets, called *blocks*. (See [40, Chs. 2 & 3] for a review of random partitions.) We may write $\Pi = \{A_1, A_2, \dots\}$, where A_1 is the block containing 1 and A_{k+1}, for every $k \geq 1$, is the (possibly empty) block containing the least integer not in $A_1 \cup \cdots \cup A_k$. For every $n \geq 1$, let Π_n be the restriction of Π to $[n] := \{1, \dots, n\}$. For every $n \geq k \geq 1$, let $N_{n,k}$ be the number of elements in $A_k \cap [n]$, and let B_n be the number of (nonempty) blocks in Π_n. The partition Π_n is said to be *exchangeable* when its distribution is invariant under every permutation of the underlying set $[n]$ and Π is said to be exchangeable when every restriction Π_n, for $n \geq 1$, is exchangeable.

The random partition Π is of *Gibbs-type* when it is exchangeable and, for some $\alpha < 1$ and $V_{n,k} \geq 0$, $n \geq k \geq 1$ satisfying Eq. (1.1), we have

$$\begin{aligned} f_\Pi(n_1, \dots, n_k) &:= \mathbb{P}\{B_n = k, N_{n,1} = n_1, \dots, N_{n,k} = n_k\} \\ &= V_{n,k} \prod_{\ell=1}^{k} (1-\alpha)_{n_\ell - 1}, \end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

for every $n \geq k \geq 1$ and $n_1, \dots, n_k \geq 1$ satisfying $\sum n_j = n$. The function $f_\Pi(n_1, \dots, n_k)$, which is symmetric by exchangeability, is called the *exchangeable partition probability function*, or EPPF. The class of Gibbs-type partitions was introduced by Gnedin and Pitman [14] and has since been the subject of intense study due, in part, to the fact that the product form of the Gibbs-type EPPF in Eq. (2.1) admits closed-form solutions for many quantities of interest; some references are as follows: [1, 10, 14, 31].

An exchangeable partition can be related to the pattern of colored balls drawn from an urn in a sequence of rounds as follows: On each round, we may either (1) draw a ball from the urn at random, record the color, and place the ball back into the urn with another ball of the same color, or (2) we may place a ball of a new, previously unseen color into the urn. The distinct colors of the balls correspond to the blocks in Π, and the indices of the rounds during which a particular color was drawn indicates the members of that block. In particular, on the first round the urn is empty and a ball of a new color is placed into the urn creating $B_1 = 1$ block. We see from Eq. (2.1) that during the $n+1$-st round, on the event $k \leq B_n$, we draw a ball of the k'th previously seen color from the

urn with probability

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}\{N_{n+1,k} > N_{n,k} | B_n, N_{n,1}, N_{n,2}, \dots\} \\ = \frac{f_\Pi(N_{n,1}, \dots, N_{n,k}+1, \dots, N_{n,B_n})}{f_\Pi(N_{n,1}, \dots, N_{n,B_n})} = \frac{V_{n+1,B_n}}{V_{n,B_n}}(N_{n,k} - \alpha),\end{aligned} \tag{2.2}$$

and we draw a ball of a new color with probability

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}\{B_{n+1} > B_n | B_n, N_{n,1}, N_{n,2}, \dots\} \\ = \frac{f_\Pi(N_{n,1}, \dots, N_{n,B_n}, 1)}{f_\Pi(N_{n,1}, \dots, N_{n,B_n})} = \frac{V_{n+1,B_n+1}}{V_{n,B_n}}.\end{aligned} \tag{2.3}$$

Gnedin and Pitman [14, § 2] show that the distribution of the number of blocks after the n'th round is given by

$$\mathbb{P}\{B_n = k\} = \frac{V_{n,k}}{\alpha^k}\mathscr{C}(n,k;\alpha), \qquad k \leq n, \tag{2.4}$$

where $\mathscr{C}(n,k;\alpha)$ is the generalized factorial coefficient given in Eq. (1.3).

By a representation theorem due to Kingman [28], every exchangeable partition may be obtained from the ties among an exchangeable sequence sampled from a random probability measure, and the laws of the partition and measure are one-to-one. (The measures inducing the Gibbs-type partitions are called Gibbs-type random measures.) For the remainder, we will therefore refer to (the law of) an exchangeable partition by (the law of) its inducing random measure. Aside from the partitions induced by the Pitman–Yor (and, thus, Dirichlet) processes, the Gibbs-type class contains several more exotic subclasses: When $\alpha \in (0,1)$, $\beta > 0$, and the weights $\overrightarrow{V}$ are given by

$$V_{n,k} = \frac{e^\beta \alpha^{k-1}}{\Gamma(n)} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \binom{n-1}{i} (-1)^i \beta^{i/\alpha} \Gamma(k - i/\alpha; \beta), \tag{2.5}$$

where $\Gamma(x;a) := \int_x^\infty s^{a-1}e^{-s}\mathrm{d}s$ is the incomplete gamma function, one recovers the EPPF of the partitions induced by the *normalized generalized gamma processes* [31, 41]. Special cases include the partitions induced by the *normalized inverse Gaussian processes* [30] when $\alpha = 1/2$; the *normalized α-stable processes* [27] in the limit $\beta \to 0$; and the Dirichlet processes, again, in the limit $\alpha \to 0$. The class of normalized generalized gamma processes are notable in that they are the only *normalized completely random measures* [23, 43] that are of Gibbs-type [32, Prop. 2].

More generally, Gnedin and Pitman [14, Thm. 12] showed that every Gibbs-type partition with fixed discount parameter $\alpha < 1$ is a unique probability mixture of one of three extreme partitions, depending on the value of α. When $\alpha \in (0,1)$, the extreme partition is induced by the *α-stable Poisson–Kingman measures* [41, §5.3 and §5.4], and it follows from [41, Prop. 9] that

$$V_{n,k} = \frac{\alpha^k}{\Gamma(n-k\alpha)} \int_0^\infty \Big[\int_0^1 p^{n-k\alpha-1} f_\alpha(t(1-p))\mathrm{d}p\Big] t^{-k\alpha} h(t)\mathrm{d}t, \tag{2.6}$$

where f_α is the density of a positive α-stable random variable, and $h\colon \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}_+$ is a measurable function such that $h(t)f_\alpha(t)$ is a proper density function on $\mathbb{R}_+$. The choice for h then specifies the model. For example, when $h(t) = \frac{\Gamma(\theta+1)}{\Gamma(\theta/\alpha+1)}t^{-\theta}$ for some $\theta > -\alpha$, then Eq. (2.6) reduces to Eq. (1.4) and we obtain the partitions induced by the Pitman–Yor processes (with $\alpha \in (0,1)$). When $h(t) = e^{\beta^\alpha - \beta t}$ for some $\beta > 0$, then Eq. (2.6) reduces to Eq. (2.5) and we obtain the partitions induced by the normalized generalized gamma processes. See Pitman [41, §5] for further examples.

When $\alpha = 0$, the extreme partition is induced by the Dirichlet processes with concentration parameter $\theta > 0$. Finally, when $\alpha < 0$, the extreme partition is induced by the Pitman–Yor processes with concentration parameter $\theta = m|\alpha|$, for some m in $\mathbb{N}$. This is equivalent to an urn scheme with a finite number m of different colors [40, Ch. 3, Sec. 2]. In summary, each Gibbs-type partition with fixed $\alpha < 1$ is a unique probability mixture of the extreme partition that is induced by either

1. the Pitman–Yor processes with discount parameter α and concentration parameter $\theta = m|\alpha|$ for m in $\mathbb{N}$, when $\alpha < 0$;
2. the Dirichlet processes with concentration parameter $\theta > 0$, when $\alpha = 0$;
3. or an α-stable Poisson–Kingman partition, when $\alpha \in (0,1)$.

Members of the class are obtained by mixing over the concentration parameter θ in the case $\alpha = 0$, the number of species m in the case $\alpha < 0$, or over the function $h(t)$ when $\alpha \in (0,1)$. For the remainder of the article, however, we will treat these parameters as non-random for simplicity; it is straightforward to mix over these parameters during posterior inference (see Section 6). As we will soon see, each Gibbs-type IBP corresponds to a Gibbs-type partition, and so it will suffice to characterize the Gibbs-type IBP in each of these regimes.

3. Constructions from random measures

Thibaux and Jordan [49] connected exchangeable feature allocations with the theory of completely random measures by showing that the IBP is the combinatorial structure of an exchangeable sequence of Bernoulli processes directed by a beta process [19]. Similarly, Roy [44] identifies a class of *generalized beta processes* arising from IBPs parameterized by partition models. Here we focus on the particular case relating to Gibbs-type partitions.

3.1. Gibbs-type beta processes

Let Π be the exchangeable Gibbs-type partition with EPPF f_Π defined by Eq. (2.1). By Kingman's paint-box construction [28], the limiting relative frequencies of the blocks

$$P_k := \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{N_{n,k}}{n} \tag{3.1}$$

exist almost surely for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$. For every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, let μ_k be the distribution of P_k. Of particular importance will be the distribution μ_1 of P_1, which is called the *structural distribution* and tells us much about the exchangeable partition, but does not necessarily characterize it [40, Ch. 2.3]. Let Ω be a complete, separable metric space and let $\mathcal{A}$ be its Borel σ-algebra. Following Roy [44, Thm. 1.2], define a purely atomic random measure B on $(\Omega, \mathcal{A})$ by

$$B := \sum_{k \geq 1} b_k \delta_{\omega_k}, \tag{3.2}$$

where $(\omega_1, b_1), (\omega_2, b_2), \dots$ are the points of a Poisson process on $\Omega \times (0, 1]$ with (σ-finite) intensity

$$\nu_\Pi(\mathrm{d}\omega \times \mathrm{d}p) := B_0(\mathrm{d}\omega)\, p^{-1} \mu_1(\mathrm{d}p), \tag{3.3}$$

for some non-atomic σ-finite measure B_0 on $(\Omega, \mathcal{A})$. Note that, because ν_Π is not a finite measure, B will have an infinite number of atoms, almost surely. We call B a *Gibbs-type beta process with EPPF f_Π and base measure B_0*. Also note that the construction of B ensures that the random variables $B(A_1), \dots, B(A_k)$ are independent for every finite, disjoint collection $A_1, \dots, A_k \in \mathcal{A}$, and B is therefore said to be *completely random* or have *independent increments*. (See Kingman [26] for a background on completely random measures.) Following Thibaux and Jordan [49], define a sequence $(Z_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} := (Z_1, Z_2, \dots)$ of random measures on $(\Omega, \mathcal{A})$ that are conditionally i.i.d., given B, with

$$Z_n = \sum_{k \geq 1} 1_{\{U_{n,k} < b_k\}} \delta_{\omega_k}, \qquad n \in \mathbb{N}, \tag{3.4}$$

where $(U_{n,k})_{n,k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a collection of i.i.d. Uniform$(0, 1)$ random variables, independent also from B. Then $(Z_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is an exchangeable sequence of Bernoulli processes that are rendered conditionally-i.i.d. by B. By construction, because B is completely random, so are the $(Z_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, both conditionally on B, and unconditionally.

Fix $n \in \mathbb{N}$. We now follow Hjort [19] and derive the conditional distribution of Z_{n+1}, given $Z_1, \dots, Z_n$. Let $\omega_1, \dots, \omega_{K_n}$ be the K_n distinct atoms among $Z_1, \dots, Z_n$. For every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, the measure Z_{n+1} takes atom ω_k with probability b_k given $k \leq K_n$. By applying [25, Thm. 3.3] and normalizing, we find that the conditional distribution of b_k, given $Z_1, \dots, Z_n$, is

$$\mathbb{P}\{b_k \in \mathrm{d}p \mid Z_1, \dots, Z_n\} = \frac{p^{S_{n,k}}(1-p)^{n-S_{n,k}} \nu_\Pi(\mathrm{d}\omega_k \times \mathrm{d}p)}{\int_{(0,1]} p^{S_{n,k}}(1-p)^{n-S_{n,k}} \nu_\Pi(\mathrm{d}\omega_k \times \mathrm{d}p)} \tag{3.5}$$

$$= \frac{p^{S_{n,k}-1}(1-p)^{n-S_{n,k}} \mu_1(\mathrm{d}p)}{g(n, S_{n,k})}, \tag{3.6}$$

where $S_{n,k} := \sum_{j=1}^n Z_j\{\omega_k\}$, for $k \leq K_n$, and

$$g(n, k) := \int_{(0,1]} p^{k-1}(1-p)^{n-k} \mu_1(\mathrm{d}p). \tag{3.7}$$

We therefore have

$$\mathbb{P}\{Z_{n+1,k} = 1 \mid Z_1, \ldots, Z_n\} = \mathbb{E}[b_k \mid Z_1, \ldots, Z_n] \tag{3.8}$$

$$= \frac{g(n+1, S_{n,k}+1)}{g(n, S_{n,k})}. \tag{3.9}$$

With another application of [25, Thm. 3.3], we may derive the distribution of the atoms of Z_{n+1} that have not appeared among $Z_1, \ldots, Z_n$. Informally speaking, for $\mathrm{d}\omega \subseteq \Omega \setminus \{\omega_1, \ldots, \omega_{K_n}\}$ we have

$$\mathbb{P}\{Z_{n+1}(\mathrm{d}\omega) = 1 \mid Z_1, \ldots, Z_n\} = \int_{(0,1]} p(1-p)^n \nu_\Pi(\mathrm{d}\omega \times \mathrm{d}p) \tag{3.10}$$

$$= B_0(\mathrm{d}\omega) g(n+1, 1). \tag{3.11}$$

More precisely, on $\Omega \setminus \{\omega_1, \ldots, \omega_{K_n}\}$, the measure Z_{n+1} is a Poisson process with intensity measure $g(n+1,1)B_0$, and the number of new atoms in Z_{n+1} is Poisson distributed with rate $\gamma g(n+1,1)$, where $\gamma := B_0(\Omega) < \infty$.

3.2. Exchangeable feature allocations of Gibbs-type

In the buffet process analogy, the Bernoulli process Z_n represents the n-th customer, and each atom of Z_n represents a dish taken by the customer. Then K_n represents the total number of dishes taken by the first n customers, and $S_{n,k}$ is the number of customers that sampled dish k. Indeed, we will now show that the mean of the Bernoulli distribution in Eq. (3.9) matches the probability that the $n+1$-st customer takes a dish sampled $S_{n,k}$ times previously and that the number of new dishes taken by this customer matches the number of atoms in a Poisson process with the intensity measure in Eq. (3.10).

To analyze Eqs. (3.9) and (3.10), we need only study the triangular array of integrals $g(n,s)$, for $n \geq s \geq 1$. The structural distribution μ_1 relates the Gibbs-type beta process B to the probabilities of combinatorial events with the exchangeable partition Π_n. In particular, note that

$$g(n,s) = \mathbb{P}\{N_{s,1} = s \wedge N_{n,1} = s\} = \mathbb{P}\{N_{n,B_{n-s+1}} = s\}, \tag{3.12}$$

where the first equality follows by definition, and the second equality follows by exchangeability (i.e., we may reorder the first s draws from the urn scheme to instead be the last s draws without affecting this probability). Clearly $g(1,1) = 1$. Consider $g(n+1,1) = \mathbb{P}\{N_{n+1,B_{n+1}} = 1\} = \mathbb{P}\{B_{n+1} > B_n\}$. This is the probability that a new color is drawn on the $n+1$-st round, which conditioned on B_n is given by $V_{n+1,B_n+1}/V_{n,B_n}$ (c.f. Eq. (2.3)). Then by taking expectation over B_n (with respect to Eq. (2.4)), we have for every $n \geq 1$,

$$\mathbb{P}\{B_{n+1} > B_n\} = \mathbb{E}\Big[\frac{V_{n+1,B_n+1}}{V_{n,B_n}}\Big] = \sum_{k=1}^{n} \Big(\frac{V_{n+1,k+1}}{\alpha^k} \mathscr{C}(n,k;\alpha)\Big) = F^n_{\alpha,\Theta}(1,1),$$

where we recall that $F^n_{\alpha,\Theta}(\cdot,\cdot)$ was given by Eq. (1.2). This is the distribution of the number of new dishes in the Gibbs-type IBP.

In general, $g(n,s) = \mathbb{P}\{N_{n,B_{n-s+1}} = s\}$ is the probability that a new color is drawn on the $(n-s+1)$-st iteration and then drawn again $s-1$ times in a row. Conditioned on B_{n-s}, sampling a new color occurs with probability $V_{n-s+1,B_{n-s}+1}/V_{n-s,B_{n-s}}$, and drawing this color $s-1$ additional times occurs with probability

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{V_{n-s+2,B_{n-s}+1}}{V_{n-s+1,B_{n-s}+1}}(1-\alpha)\frac{V_{n-s+3,B_{n-s}+1}}{V_{n-s+2,B_{n-s}+1}}(2-\alpha)\cdots\frac{V_{n,B_{n-s}+1}}{V_{n-1,B_{n-s}+1}}(s-1-\alpha)\\ = \frac{V_{n,B_{n-s}+1}}{V_{n-s+1,B_{n-s}+1}}(1-\alpha)_{s-1}.\end{aligned} \tag{3.13}$$

Multiplying, we have

$$\mathbb{P}\{N_{n,B_{n-s+1}} = s \mid B_{n-s}\} = \frac{V_{n,B_{n-s}+1}}{V_{n-s,B_{n-s}}}(1-\alpha)_{s-1}. \tag{3.14}$$

With an iterated expectation and Eq. (3.14), we may write

$$\frac{g(n+1,s+1)}{g(n,s)} = \frac{(1-\alpha)_s}{(1-\alpha)_{s-1}}\mathbb{E}\Big[\frac{V_{n+1,B_{n-s}+1}}{V_{n-s,B_{n-s}}}\frac{V_{n-s,B_{n-s}}}{V_{n,B_{n-s}+1}}\Big] \tag{3.15}$$

$$= (s-\alpha)\mathbb{E}\Big[\frac{V_{n+1,B_{n-s}+1}}{V_{n,B_{n-s}+1}}\Big]. \tag{3.16}$$

We now recall that on the event $\{N_{n,B_{n-s+1}} = s\}$ we have $B_{n-s}+1 = B_{n-s+1} = B_n$, and Eq. (3.16) is therefore equal to

$$(s-\alpha)\mathbb{E}\Big[\frac{V_{n+1,B_n}}{V_{n,B_n}}\Big] = (s-\alpha)\sum_{k=1}^{n}\frac{V_{n+1,k}}{\alpha^k}\mathscr{C}(n,k;\alpha) = (s-\alpha)F^n_{\alpha,\Theta}(1,0), \tag{3.17}$$

which together with $s = S_{n,k}$ shows that Eq. (3.9) agrees with the probability of taking a previously sampled dish in the Gibbs-type IBP.

In Appendix A, we show that the joint distribution of a finite collection $Z_1,\dots,Z_n$ is characterized by

$$\begin{aligned}p(Z_1,\dots,Z_n) = \gamma^{K_n}\exp\Big(-\gamma\sum_{j=1}^{n}F^{j-1}_{\alpha,\Theta}(1,1)\Big)\\ \times\prod_{k=1}^{K_n}\Big[(1-\alpha)_{S_{n,k}-1}F^{n-S_{n,k}}_{\alpha,\Theta}(S_{n,k},1)B_0(\mathrm{d}\omega_k)\Big],\end{aligned} \tag{3.18}$$

where we define $F^0_{\alpha,\Theta}(n,1) := (1-\alpha)_{n-1}V_{n,1}$ for every $n \geq 1$. Eqs. (3.9), (3.10) and (3.18) are all special cases of the more general results by Roy [44, Thm. 1.6]

for when the underlying partition is not necessarily of Gibbs-type. Here, however, we have taken alternative approaches to their derivations that highlight many connections to the Gibbs-type recursions in Eq. (1.1). We also note here that other generalizations of the IBP appearing in the literature are derived from similar manipulations of completely random measures [5, 22, 24]

3.3. Special cases

Clearly, any EPPF of the Gibbs-type form in Eq. (2.1) will induce a Gibbs-type IBP. Some special cases of these constructions are already known in the literature. We have already discussed the Gibbs-type IBPs corresponding to partitions induced by the Pitman–Yor (and, thus, Dirichlet) processes. Indeed, in the Pitman–Yor process case the structural distribution is $\mu_1 = \text{beta}(1-\alpha, \theta+\alpha)$ for $\alpha \in [0,1)$ and $\theta > -\alpha$. In this case, the Gibbs-type beta process specializes to the *stable* (or *three-parameter*) *beta process*[47], which contains the original beta process when $\alpha = 0$. Despite those authors not studying the case when $\alpha < 0$ and $\theta = m|\alpha|$, for some m in $\mathbb{N}$, we may just as well define this extension of the stable beta process and stable IBP. Indeed, the structural distribution in this case is of the same form, which ensures that the construction of B and $(Z_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ are likewise of the same form. See [39, Prop. 9 and the text following] for references on the structural distributions in all of these cases.

As described at the end of Section 2, the only remaining case of the Gibbs-type IBPs to consider are those corresponding to the Gibbs-type partitions with $\alpha \in (0,1)$, which are the partitions induced by the α-stable Poisson–Kingman processes. In this case, Favaro and Walker [9] showed that the structural distribution μ_1 admits the density function on $(0,1)$ given by

$$p(v) = \frac{\alpha}{\Gamma(1-\alpha)} v^{-\alpha} \int_0^\infty t^{-\alpha} h(t) f_\alpha(t(1-v)) \mathrm{d}t, \tag{3.19}$$

where f_α and h are as in Eq. (2.6). For the remainder, we will refer to any subclass of the Gibbs-type beta process or IBP (with EPPF f_Π) by the name of the random measures inducing the random partitions with EPPF f_Π. For example, we will say *Pitman–Yor-type beta process* and *Pitman–Yor-type IBP* instead of stable beta process and stable IBP, etc.

4. Stick-breaking representations

So-called *stick-breaking* representations for the beta process [35–37, 48] are analogous to the stick-breaking constructions for random probability measures such as Dirichlet and Pitman–Yor processes [21, 45]. These representations are useful for applications because they lead to practical inference procedures. Roy [44] provides the analogous stick-breaking representation for the random measure in Eq. (3.2) corresponding to any inducing EPPF, and shows that a stick-breaking representation for the underlying partition model provides the stick-breaking

procedure for the corresponding feature allocation model. Because practical stick-breaking constructions for every Gibbs-type partition are available in the literature, we may obtain practical constructions for every subclass of the Gibbs-type beta process. Unsurprisingly, these results maintain both their generality and their practicality due to the special properties of the Gibbs-type class. Here we summarize these results.

A Gibbs-type beta process B (with EPPF f_Π and base measure B_0) may be constructed as [44, Thm. 1.3]

$$B = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \sum_{j=1}^{C_i} P_{i,j} \delta_{\omega_{i,j}}, \tag{4.1}$$

where $(C_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$, $(\omega_{i,j})_{i,j\in\mathbb{N}}$, and $(P_{i,j})_{j\in\mathbb{N}}$ are independent processes satisfying

1. $(C_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ are i.i.d. Poisson(γ) random variables with $\gamma := B_0(\Omega)$;
2. $(\omega_{i,j})_{i,j\in\mathbb{N}}$ are i.i.d. random elements in Ω with distribution $\gamma^{-1}B_0$;
3. and, for every $i \in \mathbb{N}$, the random variables in the collection $(P_{i,j})_{j\in\mathbb{N}}$ are i.i.d. copies of P_i, which we recall is the limiting block frequency in Eq. (3.1) with distribution μ_i.

Note that P_i is the i-th "stick" in a stick-breaking representation for the random probability measure underlying the f_Π-partitions. (See [21] for a background on stick-breaking representations for random probability measures.) The problem of constructing B then amounts to that of constructing the sticks $(P_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$, which has been accomplished for all subclasses of the Gibbs-type partitions.

For every $i \in \mathbb{N}$, let

$$P_i = W_i \prod_{j=1}^{i-1} (1 - W_j), \tag{4.2}$$

with $P_1 = W_1$, for some random elements $W := (W_j)_{j\in\mathbb{N}}$ in $(0, 1]$. If $W_j \overset{iid}{\sim} \text{beta}(1, \theta)$, for every $j \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\theta > 0$, then Eq. (4.2) is the i-th stick of a Dirichlet process [45]. In this case, Paisley et al. [35] showed that B is a Dirichlet-type beta process (with concentration parameter θ and base measure B_0). (See Paisley et al. [37] for an alternative proof of this construction, and see Teh et al. [48] for a related stick-breaking construction for the Dirichlet-type beta process.) If the random variables W are merely independent with $W_j \overset{ind}{\sim} \text{beta}(1 - \alpha, \theta + j\alpha)$, for every $j \in \mathbb{N}$ and some $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and $\theta > -\alpha$, then Eq. (4.2) is the i-th stick of a Pitman–Yor process [38]. In this case, Broderick et al. [2] showed that B is a Pitman–Yor-type beta process (with discount parameter α, concentration parameter θ, and base measure B_0). As with the Pitman–Yor IBP, these authors did not consider a stick-breaking construction for the Pitman–Yor beta process with $\alpha < 0$ and $\theta = m|\alpha|$ for some m in $\mathbb{N}$. However, the sticks of the Pitman–Yor processes in this case are still independent and distributed as $V_j \sim \text{beta}(1-\alpha, m|\alpha| + j\alpha)$, for every $j \in \mathbb{N}$ [39, Prop. 9], and so this extension does indeed arise from the construction in Eq. (4.1).

In order to complete our stick-breaking representations for the Gibbs-type beta processes, all that remains is to describe the distribution of W in the case when $\alpha \in (0,1)$. Favaro and Walker [9] show that the sequence $(W_j)_{j\in\mathbb{N}}$ are dependent random variables in this case, which may be characterized sequentially as follows: The first stick $P_1 = W_1$ has distribution μ_1 given by Eq. (3.19). For every $j \geq 2$, conditioned on $W_1, \ldots, W_{j-1}$, the random variable W_j admits a conditional density on $(0,1]$ with density function

$$\begin{aligned} p(w_j \mid w_1, \ldots, w_{j-1}) = \frac{\alpha}{\Gamma(1-\alpha)}\Big[w_j \prod_{k=1}^{j-1}(1-w_k)\Big]^{-\alpha} \\ \times \int_0^\infty t^{-\alpha} \frac{f_\alpha(t\prod_{k=1}^{j}(1-w_k))}{f_\alpha(t\prod_{k=1}^{j-1}(1-w_k))} h(t) f_\alpha(t)\mathrm{d}t, \end{aligned} \tag{4.3}$$

where h and f_α are as in Eq. (2.6). An algorithm for slice sampling the sequence W was provided therein. Favaro et al. [11] showed that, under certain assumptions on the parameter α, these sticks can be directly constructed with beta and gamma random variables.

We present one final stick-breaking representation for the Gibbs-type beta process, analogous to that given by Thibaux and Jordan [49] and Teh and Görür [47] for the Dirichlet- and Pitman–Yor-type beta processes, respectively, and generalized by Roy [44, Thm. 1.4]. This construction represents the measures $\sum_{j=1}^{C_i} P_{i,j}\delta_{\omega_{i,j}}$, for every $i \in \mathbb{N}$, in Eq. (4.1) with independent Poisson processes. Let

$$B = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sum_{(\omega,p)\in\eta_n} p\,\delta_\omega, \tag{4.4}$$

where $\eta_0, \eta_1, \eta_2, \ldots$ are independent Poisson processes on $\Omega \times (0,1]$ with finite intensity measures

$$(\mathbb{E}\eta_n)(\mathrm{d}\omega \times \mathrm{d}p) = B_0(\mathrm{d}\omega)(1-p)^n \mu_1(\mathrm{d}p), \qquad n \in \{0,1,2,\ldots\}. \tag{4.5}$$

One may verify that B in Eq. (4.4) is indeed the Gibbs-type beta process given by Eq. (3.3) using a Poisson process superposition argument and the identity $p^{-1} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty}(1-p)^n$. The Gibbs-type partitions with $\alpha < 0$ have intensities

$$(\mathbb{E}\eta_n)(\mathrm{d}\omega \times \mathrm{d}p) = B_0(\mathrm{d}\omega)\frac{\Gamma(1+\theta)}{\Gamma(1-\alpha)\Gamma(\theta+\alpha)} p^{-\alpha}(1-p)^{\theta+\alpha+n-1}\mathrm{d}p, \tag{4.6}$$

where $\theta = m|\alpha|$ for some m in $\mathbb{N}$. This same form characterizes the Gibbs-type partitions with $\alpha = 0$ by setting $\theta > 0$. When $\alpha \in (0,1)$ and $\theta > -\alpha$, this construction characterizes the rest of the Pitman–Yor-type beta processes; more generally, the Gibbs-type IBPs with $\alpha \in (0,1)$ have

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbb{E}\eta_n)(\mathrm{d}\omega \times \mathrm{d}p) = B_0(\mathrm{d}\omega)\frac{\alpha}{\Gamma(1-\alpha)}(1-p)^n p^{-\alpha} \\ \times \Big[\int_0^\infty t^{-\alpha} h(t) f_\alpha(t(1-p))\mathrm{d}t\Big]\mathrm{d}p, \end{aligned} \tag{4.7}$$

for h and f_α as in Eq. (2.6).

These stick-breaking representations are useful for applications because inference procedures may be obtained in which the sticks are auxiliary variables [35–37, 48]. Though only a finite number of the sticks may be represented in practice, these representations yield error bounds when we truncate the outer sums in either Eq. (4.1) or Eq. (4.4) to a finite number of terms. (See [44, Thm. 1.5] for the most general of these results.) Additionally, a Markov chain Monte Carlo routine including an auxiliary variable may be used to numerically integrate over the number of represented sticks, which removes the approximation error in the asymptotic regime of the Markov chain.

5. Controlling the statistics of latent features

In statistical applications, it is important to tailor the assumptions that a model encodes about the structure and complexity of the data. In this section, we characterize the asymptotic behavior of the distribution of the latent features in the Gibbs-type IBP.

5.1. Limiting frequency of a feature

Order the features in a Gibbs-type IBP first by their order of appearance, and, when there are ties, randomly. Recall that $S_{n,k}$ denotes the number of customers among the first n that sampled dish k. By [44, Thm. 6.19], the limiting frequencies of the features

$$C_k := \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{S_{n,k}}{n} \tag{5.1}$$

exist almost surely for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$. These quantities may be viewed as the feature allocation analogue to the limiting frequencies $(P_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ of the blocks in the f_Π-partition, i.e., the "sticks" of the random probability measure underlying the f_Π-partitions, given by Eq. (3.1). For every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\tilde{\mu}_k$ denote the distribution of C_k. Informally, we may similarly interpret $(C_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ as sticks in the stick-breaking representations for the Gibbs-type beta process in Section 4, and it follows from Eqs. (4.4) and (4.5) that $\tilde{\mu}_1 = \mu_1$, and for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, that

$$\tilde{\mu}_k(\mathrm{d}p) = \mathbb{E}\Big[\frac{(1-p)^{M-1}\mu_1(\mathrm{d}p)}{\int_{[0,1]}(1-p)^{M-1}\mu_1(\mathrm{d}p)}\Big] \tag{5.2}$$

for some random element M in $\mathbb{N}$. Roy [44, Lem. 4.4] shows that M is the index of the first customer in the IBP to sample the k-th dish.

We see that, for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, the asymptotic behavior of C_k is determined by the structural distribution, μ_1, of the underlying partition model. The choice of structural distribution provides a variety of modeling options to the practitioner. For example, in Fig. 1 we display the structural distributions for the Pitman–Yor and normalized generalized gamma processes with $\alpha = 1/2$ (i.e., the normalized



FIG 1. *Densities of the structural distributions of the Pitman–Yor (PY), normalized inverse Gaussian (NIG), and normalized generalized gamma (NGG) processes. The horizontal axis in each plot is the support* $(0, 1)$ *of the density.*

inverse Gaussian process in the latter case) over a range of their remaining free parameter. While further theory would be welcome, it currently appears best to choose this structural distribution (i.e., subclass of Gibbs-type IBP) experimentally, as described in Sections 6 and 7.

5.2. Power-law behavior when $\alpha \in (0, 1)$

Let $K_{n,j}$ denote the number of dishes sampled exactly j times among the first n customers, and, as before, let K_n denote the number of dishes sampled among the first n customers in the Gibbs-type IBP. As we saw in Section 2, when $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ the underlying Gibbs-type partitions correspond to the class of partitions induced by the α-stable Poisson–Kingman measures, which includes the normalized generalized gamma processes and a subclass of the Pitman–Yor processes. These models have been shown to exhibit *power-law* (i.e., heavy-tailed) behavior in the asymptotic distribution on the number of blocks in the partition [31, 41]. Empirical measurements in a variety of domains have been shown to exhibit power-law behavior. For example, the occurrence of unique words in a document, the degrees of interactions in a protein network, or the number of citations for an academic article, all exhibit power law behavior. See [7] for a survey. An appropriate model for data that may depend on these factors should be expressive enough to capture this behavior in its latent structure. It was shown by Teh and Görür [47] and Broderick et al. [2] that the Pitman–Yor IBP exhibits power-law behavior in the asymptotic distributions of K_n and $K_{n,j}$. We will now see that this behavior is in a sense inherited from the partitions induced by the Pitman–Yor processes, and that power-law behavior for any partition induced by a α-stable Poisson–Kingman measure translates into power-law behavior in the corresponding Gibbs-type IBP.

Let ν_Π be the Lévy intensity of the Gibbs-type beta process defined in Eq. (3.3), parameterized by the structural distribution for the α-stable Poisson–Kingman measures in Eq. (3.19). In this case, it follows analogously to [2, p. 459] that ν_Π satisfies the limiting behavior

$$\int_{\Omega \times (0,x]} p \, \nu_\Pi(\mathrm{d}\omega \times \mathrm{d}p) \sim \frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha} C x^{1-\alpha}, \text{as } x \to 0, \tag{5.3}$$

for a constant

$$C := \int_0^\infty t^{-\alpha} h(t) f_\alpha(t) \mathrm{d}t, \tag{5.4}$$

where $\sim$ indicates that the ratio of the left and right hand sides tends to one in the specified limit. With derivations analogous to [2, Prop. 6.1, Lem. 6.2, Lem. 6.3, & Prop. 6.4], it is straightforward to verify that, with probability one,

$$K_n \sim \gamma C n^\alpha \quad \text{and} \quad K_{n,j} \sim \gamma \frac{\alpha \Gamma(j-\alpha)}{j!\,\Gamma(1-\alpha)} C n^\alpha, \ \text{as } n \to \infty. \tag{5.5}$$

These statistics therefore exhibit power law behavior controlled by the value of $\alpha \in (0,1)$; the closer α is to one, the heavier the tails of these distributions. By choosing $h(t) = \frac{\Gamma(\theta+1)}{\Gamma(\theta/\alpha+1)} t^{-\theta}$ for some $\theta > -\alpha$, we have that ν_Π is the Lévy intensity of the Pitman–Yor beta process, and $C = \alpha^{-1}\Gamma(\theta+1)/\Gamma(\theta+\alpha)$, which was previously derived by Broderick et al. [2]. By choosing $h(t) = e^{\beta^\alpha - \beta t}$, for some $\beta > 0$, then ν_Π is the Lévy intensity of a normalized generalized gamma beta process, and we find that $C = e^{\beta^\alpha} \int_0^\infty t^{-\alpha} e^{-\beta t} f_\alpha(t) \mathrm{d}t$. In this case, if $\alpha = 1/2$, then ν_Π is the Lévy intensity of a normalized inverse Gaussian beta process, and C has a closed form solution given by $C = \frac{2}{\pi} \beta^{1/2} e^{\beta^{1/2}} \phi_1(\beta^{1/2})$, where ϕ_ν is the modified Bessel function of the third type.

In order to compare the power-law behaviors of different Gibbs-type paritions, Blasi et al. [1] chose hyperparameters for the Pitman–Yor and normalized generalized gamma processes such that the expected number of blocks in the corresponding partitions satisfy $\mathbb{E}[B_{50}] \approx 25$. By plotting statistics such as the expected number of blocks B_n in the partition as n varies, one may visualize differences in the asymptotic behaviors between the models. As one should expect, these hyperparameter settings also provide an appropriate comparison for their corresponding Gibbs-type IBPs. In particular, recall that in the Gibbs-type IBP the j-th customer samples a Poisson$(\gamma F_{\alpha,\Theta}^{j-1}(1,1))$ number of new dishes. Then the total number of dishes K_n sampled by n customers has a Poisson distribution with mean $\gamma \sum_{j=1}^n F_{\alpha,\Theta}^{j-1}(1,1)$, where we recall that $F_{\alpha,\Theta}^0(1,1) := 1$. We then have that $\mathbb{E}[K_{50}] \approx 25\gamma$ for both the Pitman–Yor and normalized generalized gamma IBP models.

In Fig. 2, we plot the behavior of K_n and $K_{n,1}$ as n increases for different Gibbs-type IBP subclasses at these parameter settings, with the additional choice of $\gamma = 1$. We can see that, for a comparable set of hyperparameters, the normalized generalized gamma type IBP exhibits heavier tails than the Pitman–Yor type IBP on both statistics, though in smaller n regimes the reverse holds. The normalized inverse Gaussian type IBP, at the same setting of $\beta = 1$, exhibits similar tail behavior in $K_{n,1}$ to the Pitman–Yor type IBP. For comparison, the asymptotic behavior of K_n with the Dirichlet type IBP at the same hyperparameter setting as the Pitman–Yor type IBP is also displayed, which does not exhibit power-law behavior (K_n grows proportionally with $\log n$ in this case [12]). These characteristics distinguish the subclasses of α-stable Poisson–Kingman type IBPs and provide a variety of power-law modeling options to the practitioner.



(a) Asymptotic behavior of K_n. (b) Asymptotic behavior of $K_{n,1}$.

FIG 2. *The behavior of K_n (the number of features) and $K_{n,1}$ (the number of features with exactly one assignment) for several subclasses of the Gibbs-type IBP, as n increases. Heavy-tailed behavior demonstrates power-law properties.*

5.3. Asymptotic behavior when $\alpha \leq 0$

Recall that the Gibbs-type partitions with $\alpha = 0$ coincide with the random partitions induced by the Dirichlet processes with concentration parameter θ. With probability one, the number of blocks in the partition of $[n]$ satisfies $B_n \sim \theta \log n$ as $n \to \infty$ [29]. Similarly, with probability one, the number of features in the corresponding Gibbs-type IBP (i.e., the original IBP) satisfies $K_n \sim \gamma\theta \log n$ as $n \to \infty$ [12], where γ is the mass parameter.

Finally, recall that the Gibbs-type partitions with $\alpha < 0$ coincide with the random partitions induced by the Pitman–Yor processes with discount parameter $\alpha < 0$ and concentration parameter $\theta = m|\alpha|$ (c.f. Eq. (1.5)), where m is a *random* element in $\mathbb{N}$ [40, Ch. 3, Sec. 2]; [14, Thm. 12]. This subclass may be interpreted as an urn scheme with a finite—but random—number of colors m. In this case, with probability one, $B_n = m$ for all sufficiently large n. That is, there are a finite number of blocks that are eventually exhausted. As one may anticipate, the corresponding Gibbs-type IBP in this regime has similar behavior. In particular, we saw in Section 3.1 that the number of new dishes K^+_{n+1} sampled by the $n+1$-st customer in the Gibbs-type IBP is Poisson distributed with rate $\gamma\mathbb{P}\{B_{n+1} > B_n\}$ (c.f. Eqs. (3.10) and (3.12)). Then clearly $K^+_{n+1} = 0$ for sufficiently large n, almost surely, and so we may interpret this as a Gibbs-type IBP with a random finite number of possible features.

6. Black-box posterior inference

We propose a Markov chain Monte Carlo algorithm generalizing the procedure originally developed for posterior inference with the IBP by Ghahramani et al. [12] and Meeds et al. [33]. We will see how these inference methods may be treated as a black-box, where implementing any subclass of the Gibbs-type IBP requires only the primitives $F^n_{\alpha,\Theta}(\cdot,\cdot)$ given by Eq. (1.2).

Let $\omega_1, \ldots, \omega_{K_n}$ denote the K_n unique atoms among the sequence $Z_1, \ldots, Z_n$. For every $i, k \in \mathbb{N}$, on the event $k \leq K_n$, define $Z_{i,k} := Z_i\{\omega_k\}$. Latent feature

models have been applied to a variety of problems (see [17] for a survey). In most of these applications, the features (associated with the atoms) represent latent objects or factors underlying a data set comprised of n measurements $Y := (Y_1, \ldots, Y_n)$. Here we assume that data point Y_i is associated with latent component k if $Z_{i,k} = 1$, for every $i \leq n$ and $k \leq K_n$. We will consider a specific example in the next section.

Consider resampling the element $Z_{i,k}$ from its posterior distribution, conditioned on Y and a set of latent variables Φ that are independent from $Z := (Z_{i,k})_{i \leq n,\, k \leq K_n}$. By Bayes's rule, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}\{Z_{i,k} = z \mid Y, Z_{-(i,k)}, \Phi\} \\ &\quad \propto p(Y \mid \{Z_{i,k} = 1\}, Z_{-(i,k)}, \Phi) \times \mathbb{P}\{Z_{i,k} = z \mid Z_{-(i,k)}\}, \quad z \in \{0, 1\}, \end{aligned} \tag{6.1}$$

where $p(Y \mid Z, \Phi)$ is a likelihood model, and $Z_{-(i,k)}$ denotes the elements of Z excluding $Z_{i,k}$. Recall that we have associated the i-th customer in the Indian buffet process with Z_i. By exchangeability, we may treat this as the last customer to enter the buffet, and therefore

$$\mathbb{P}\{Z_{i,k} = 1 \mid Z_{-(i,k)}\} = (S_k^{(-i)} - \alpha) F_{\alpha,\Theta}^{n-1}(1, 0), \tag{6.2}$$

where $S_k^{(-i)} := \sum_{j \neq i} Z_{j,k}$.

Conditioned on K_n, we iteratively resample (according to Eq. (6.1)) the elements $Z_{i,k}$, for every $k \leq K_n$, only when $S_k^{(-i)} > 0$. We then propose resampling the number of atoms in Z_i according to the Metropolis–Hastings proposal described by Meeds et al. [33]. In particular, we propose removing those atoms possessed by only Z_i, that is, those atoms ω_k in $\{\omega_1, \ldots, \omega_{K_n}\}$ with $Z_i\{\omega_k\} = 1$ and $S_k^{(-i)} = 0$. We propose replacing these atoms with K_i^+ new atoms (possessed only by Z_i). Note that K_i^+ is interpreted as the number of dishes taken by only the i-th customer. Because we are treating the i-th customer as the last to enter the buffet, K_i^+ is the number of new dishes sampled by the last customer and

$$K_i^+ \;\sim\; \text{Poisson}(\gamma F_{\alpha,\Theta}^{n-1}(1, 1)). \tag{6.3}$$

Proposed entries in Φ associated with the new atoms are sampled from their prior distributions. Let Z^* and Φ^* denote the proposed configurations. It is straightforward to show that the Metropolis–Hastings proposal is accepted with probability

$$\min\left\{1, \frac{p(Y \mid Z^*, \Phi^*)}{p(Y \mid Z, \Phi)}\right\}. \tag{6.4}$$

This move potentially changes the number of atoms among $Z_1, \ldots, Z_n$ and thus the number of latent features in the feature allocation. Conditioned on this new set of atoms, we proceed to the next process Z_{i+1} and repeat this procedure. Iterating these steps along with standard Gibbs sampling moves that resample the latent parameters Φ results in a Markov chain that targets the posterior

distribution of Z and Φ, conditioned on the data Y, as its steady state distribution.

In applications, it is important to set priors on the parameters γ, α and Θ governing the IBP model. Within the MCMC framework, updates to these variables can be carried out using, for example, slice sampling [34]. We note that when the mass parameter γ is given a (broad) gamma prior distribution, say $\gamma \sim \text{gamma}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)$, it follows from Eq. (3.18) that the conditional distribution of γ is again a gamma distribution:

$$\begin{aligned} p(\gamma \mid Z, \alpha, \Theta) &\propto \gamma^{K_n} \exp\Big(-\gamma \sum_{j=1}^{n} F_{\alpha,\Theta}^{j-1}(1,1)\Big) \times \text{gamma}(\gamma; \lambda_1, \lambda_2) \\ &= \text{gamma}\Big(\gamma; \lambda_1 + K_n, \lambda_2 + \sum_{j=1}^{n} F_{\alpha,\Theta}^{j-1}(1,1)\Big). \end{aligned} \tag{6.5}$$

Note that the inference procedure we have described may be treated as a black-box for any subclass of Gibbs-type IBPs, where the user only needs to supply several evaluations of the primitives $F_{\alpha,\Theta}^{n}(\cdot,\cdot)$. In particular, resampling Z only requires the two values $F_{\alpha,\Theta}^{n-1}(1,1)$ and $F_{\alpha,\Theta}^{n-1}(1,0)$ (in order to evaluate Eqs. (6.1) and (6.3)) for a dataset of size n. In order to resample the hyperparameters γ, α and Θ for the IBP model, one needs to supply $n-1$ additional evaluations to obtain $F_{\alpha,\Theta}^{n-s}(s,1)$, for $n \geq s \geq 1$, required by Eq. (3.18). These primitives may be precomputed and stored for given values of α and Θ. See Appendix B for some notes on computing these primitives, the required generalized factorial coefficients $\mathscr{C}(n,k;\alpha)$ in Eq. (1.3), and the Gibbs-type weights $\overrightarrow{V}$ for different models.

7. Experiments

We demonstrate the differences between several subclasses of the Gibbs-type IBP with numerical experiments. We do not implement models with $\alpha < 0$ here due to computational difficulties (see Appendix B for details). This section will therefore focus on subclasses of the Gibbs-type IBP with $\alpha \in [0,1)$. See Section 8 for a further discussion.

For every $i \leq n$, assume that data point Y_i is composed of p measurements $Y_i := (Y_{i,1}, \ldots, Y_{i,p})$. Consider the following factor analysis model for Y:

$$Y_{i,j} = \sum_{k=1}^{K_n} W_{i,k} Z_{i,k} A_{k,j} + \varepsilon_{i,j}, \qquad i \leq n,\ j \leq p, \tag{7.1}$$

where $W := (W_{i,k})_{k \leq K_n, i \leq n}$ are $\mathbb{R}$-valued modulating weights, $A := (A_{k,j})_{k \leq K_n, j \leq p}$ are $\mathbb{R}$-valued factor loadings, and $\varepsilon := (\varepsilon_{i,j})_{j \leq p, i \leq n}$ are additive noise terms. In

particular, let

$$W_{i,k} \mid \sigma_W \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_W^2), \qquad i \le n,\ k \le K_n, \tag{7.2}$$

$$A_{k,j} \mid \sigma_{A,j} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_{A,d}^2), \qquad j \le p,\ k \le K_n, \tag{7.3}$$

$$\varepsilon_{i,j} \mid \sigma_Y \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_Y^2), \qquad i \le n,\ j \le p, \tag{7.4}$$

where $\sigma_Y, \sigma_W, \sigma_{A,1}, \ldots, \sigma_{A,p}$ are hyperparameters given broad prior distributions. Viewing Y, Z, W, A, and ε as matrices in the obvious way, we may write $Y = (W \circ Z)A + \varepsilon$ where $\circ$ represents element-wise multiplication. Then the data Y is conditionally matrix Gaussian and admits the conditional density

$$p(Y \mid Z, W, A, \sigma_X) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{np/2}\sigma_X^{np}} \exp\Big\{-\frac{1}{2\sigma_X^2}\mathrm{tr}\Big[(Y-M)^T(Y-M)\Big]\Big\}, \tag{7.5}$$

where $M = (W \circ Z)A$. Note that, in practice, W or A may be analytically marginalized out of this likelihood expression, in which case Y is still conditionally Gaussian.

7.1. Synthetic data

First consider a synthetic latent feature allocation, displayed as a 200×50 binary matrix in Fig. 3(a). The rows correspond to the $n = 200$ data points and the columns correspond to the $K_n = 50$ latent features, that is, the i-th row and k-th column is shaded black if $Z_{i,k} = 1$ (in the notation of Section 6). In this example, every data point possesses one of the first two features, and the remaining 48 features are each only possessed by one data point. We simulate a dataset Y of $n = 200$ measurements in $p = 50$ variables from the model in Eqs. (7.1) to (7.4) with $\sigma_X = \sigma_W = 1$, and $\sigma_{A,j} = 1$ for $j \le p$.

We implemented the posterior inference procedure described in Section 6 for 6,000 burn-in iterations. In Fig. 3(b) we display the number of features inferred by the Dirichlet, Pitman–Yor, normalized inverse Gaussian, and normalized inverse gamma—denoted DP, PY, NIG, and NGG, respectively—subclasses of the Gibbs-type IBP on different subsets of the data. In particular, we ran the inference procedure on 40% of the data points, then on 50%, and so on, indicated by the horizontal axis from left to right. The mean number of inferred features (along with $\pm$ one standard deviation) over 3,000 samples following the burn-in period are displayed for each model. The true number of features in each subset of the data are also displayed for reference.

We note that all models attained approximately the same training loglikelihood given each data subset (averaged over the samples). However, the more flexible PY and NGG-IBP variants were able to more accurately infer the number of features underlying the data compared to the less expressive subclasses, the DP- and NIG-IBPs. We recall that the DP-IBP is an extreme point of both the PY- and NGG-IBP subclasses. The discount parameter α differentiates these models, and as we saw in Section 5.2, inferring this parameter allows these models to detect the power law structure present in the latent feature



(a) Latent feature matrix. (b) Inferred number of features.

FIG 3. *(a) A synthetic latent feature matrix for $n = 200$ data points with $K_{200} = 50$ features. The simulated data was in $p = 50$ variables. (b) The number of features inferred by different subclasses of Gibbs-type IBP models as we sequentially include more of the data. For each subset of the data, we plot the mean number of features over 3,000 samples following a burn-in period. Bars at $\pm$ one standard deviation are also displayed. The true number of features in each subset of the data is plotted for reference.*

allocation displayed in Fig. 3(a). In Figs. 4 and 5, we display trace plots of the Gibbs-type hyperparameters over the burn-in period, along with histograms over samples repeatedly drawn following the burn-in. We hold the scales of the axes fixed across the figures for comparison.

7.2. MNIST digits

We also applied the model in Section 6 to $n = 1000$ examples of the digit '3' from the MNIST handwritten digits dataset. We projected the data onto its first $p = 64$ principal components in order to replicate the experiment performed by Teh et al. [48] with the DP-IBP (and a more restrictive setting of the hyperparameters). Here we present the same qualitative analyses for different subclasses of the Gibbs-type IBP. The reader can see [2, 35] for similar experiments. We ran our posterior inference procedure for 20,000 iterations, which was sufficient for every model to burn-in. We collected 1,000 samples (thinned from 10,000 samples) of all latent variables in the model following the burn-in period, and we display boxplots of the number of inferred features over the collected samples in Fig. 6. In Fig. 8, we find the MAP sample (from among the collected samples) for each model, and for that sample we plot (1) the number of images sharing each feature and (2) a histogram of the number of features used by each image. For visualization, the features in the former plots are ordered according to the number of images assigned to them. The scale of the axes in the subfigures are held fixed for comparison.



(a) PY; σ burn-in trace plot

(b) PY; σ sample histogram

(c) PY; θ burn-in trace plot

(d) PY; θ sample histogram

(e) DP; θ burn-in trace plot

(f) DP; θ sample histogram

FIG 4. *Inferred Gibbs-type hyperparameters in the Dirichlet and Pitman–Yor type IBP subclasses on the synthetic dataset. The trace plots of the parameters are shown over a 6,000 iteration burn-in period, along with a histogram of 3,000 samples of the parameter collected after the burn-in.*



(a) NGG; σ burn-in trace plot

(b) NGG; σ sample histogram

(c) NGG; β burn-in trace plot

(d) NGG; β sample histogram

(e) NIG; β burn-in trace plot

(f) NIG; β sample histogram

FIG 5. *Inference of Gibbs-type hyperparameters in the normalized inverse Gaussian and normalized generalized gamma type IBP subclasses on the synthetic dataset. The trace plots of the parameters are shown over a 6,000 iteration burn-in period, along with a histogram of 3,000 samples of the parameter collected after the burn-in.*

Fig. 6 shows that the PY-IBP infers more features than the DP-IBP (based on an unpaired t-test at a 0.05 significance level). Moreover, both the NIG- and NGG-IBP models infer significantly higher numbers of features than the PY-IBP, but do not themselves differ significantly. Fig. 8 shows that these differences are due to varying power-law behaviors between the models. In particular, the PY-, NIG-, and NGG-IBP models display increasingly heavier tail behavior in the (distribution of the) number of images sharing each feature. The NGG-IBP model is notable as clearly having dramatically heavier tails than all other models in this distribution. This additionally results in a noticeably lower average number of features per image (visible in the histogram), which does not appear to differ significantly between the other three subclasses. This experiment demonstrates important variations between the Gibbs-type IBP subclasses. Compare the latent feature distributions between the three heavy-tailed variants. On one hand, the NIG-IBP has heavier tails than the PY-IBP, accomplished by creating many features to which very few images are assigned, resulting in a significantly larger number of features. On the other hand, the NGG-IBP has much heavier tails than the NIG-IBP, accomplished by heavily skewing the distribution, resulting in approximately the same total number of features. It is particularly interesting to compare the PY- and NGG-IBP models in this respect, as the DP-IBP falls into both of these subclasses. As discussed in Section 5.2, these differing properties provide several different options to the practitioner, which are all generally accessible through our black-box constructions and posterior inference procedures.

Finally, we can visualize the effect that the different latent feature distributions have on this particular application by investigating some of the latent features inferred by each model. In Fig. 9, we display the top 10 (according to the weight matrix W) most important features (represented by the factors in A) from the MAP sample collected for each model. The features inferred by the DP-, PY-, and NIG-IBP models do not appear to differ, however, the NGG-IBP clearly places the heaviest weight on its features (darker pixel values). Moreover, a few of these features appear to capture distinct parts of the digits.

8. Conclusion

The Gibbs-type IBPs are a broad class of feature allocation models, parameterized by the law of a Gibbs-type random partition. We showed how the Gibbs-type IBP can be constructed as a completely random measure and gave several stick-breaking representations. We also characterized the asymptotic behavior of the number of latent features in a Gibbs-type IBP, which was seen to mimic the asymptotic behavior of the underlying random partition. We described black-box routines for simulating and performing posterior inference with Gibbs-type IBPs that only require a set of precomputed constants that are specific to the corresponding partition law. Our numerical experiments demonstrated differences between the Gibbs-type IBP subclasses, where we saw that different extents of heavy tailed latent feature behavior could be attained beyond the PY-IBP.



FIG 6. *Number of features inferred for the MNIST dataset. Boxplots over 1,000 samples thinned from 10,000 samples collected following a burn-in period of 20,000 iterations.*

Many models that use the beta process as a basic building block can be generalized by instead using the Gibbs-type beta process. For example, Roy [44] provides a finitary construction for exchangeable sequences of Bernoulli processes (as in Eq. (3.4)) rendered conditionally i.i.d. by a *hierarchical beta process* [49]. Such processes are used as admixture models, in which a collection of feature allocations share features, analogously to random partitions induced by a hierarchical Dirichlet process. Feature allocations induced by hierarchies of Gibbs-type beta processes would be a natural generalization of this framework, providing flexible properties (such as power law behavior) to the admixture model. The Gibbs-type beta process can also be used as the random base measure for a conditionally-i.i.d. sequence of *negative binomial processes* [4, 18, 50]. One then obtains a feature allocation appended with integer-valued counts—an appropriate model for random multisets—that again inherits the properties of the Gibbs-type partitions.

Finally, we cannot practically apply the simulation or inference procedures described in this article to Gibbs-type IBPs for $\alpha < 0$, because we cannot robustly compute the required primitives $F^n_{\alpha,\Theta}(\cdot,\cdot)$ in this case (as described in Appendix B). Constructions by Roy [44, Def. 6.1] provide alternative simulation procedures, however, posterior inference algorithms have yet to be developed. The stick-breaking representations in Section 4 do not depend on these primitives, and so they may suggest an approach for inference. As shown in Section 5.3, these models have a random finite number of features, which may be useful in certain applications like their random partition counterparts [13], and their utility should be further studied.

Acknowledgements

We thank Hong Ge, Konstantina Palla, Christian Steinruecken, and anonymous reviewers for feedback on drafts; Stefano Favaro for help with (and code for)



(a) PY; inferred σ (b) PY; inferred θ

(c) NGG; inferred σ (d) NGG; inferred β

(e) DP; inferred θ (f) NIG; inferred β

FIG 7. *Inferred Gibbs-type hyperparameters for the MNIST dataset. Histograms are over 1,000 samples thinned from 10,000 samples collected following a burn-in period. Note that, unlike in other figures in this article, the scales of the axes here are not held fixed.*



(a) DP; # images sharing each feature



(b) DP; # feat. used by each image



(c) PY; # images sharing each feature



(d) PY; # feat. used by each image



(e) NIG; # images sharing each feature



(f) NIG; # feat. used by each image



(g) NGG; # images sharing each feature



(h) NGG; # feat. used by each image

FIG 8. *Latent feature statistics inferred by each model on the MNIST dataset. For each model, the number of images assigned to each feature is displayed as a plot (sorted for visualization), and the number of features used by an image is displayed as a histogram.*



FIG 9. *Top 10 (according to the weight matrix W) important features (represented by the factors in A) for the digit '3' inferred by each subclass of the Gibbs-type IBP. Darker pixel values correspond to larger values in (the corresponding factor in) A.*

implementing various Gibbs-type models; and Igor Prünster for helpful advice and pointers to references.

Appendix A: The distribution of a Gibbs-type IBP

Let $Z_1, \ldots, Z_n$ be the exchangeable sequence of Bernoulli processes on $(\Omega, \mathcal{A})$ defined by Eq. (3.4), which are rendered conditionally-i.i.d. by the Gibbs-type beta process defined by Eq. (3.2). Here we show that the distribution of $(Z_1, \ldots, Z_n)$ is given by Eq. (3.18). Let $g(n,k)$ be the integrals given by Eq. (3.7) and recall the characterization given in Eq. (3.12). Let $F^n_{\alpha,\Theta}(\cdot\,,\cdot)$ be the primitives given by Eq. (1.2). Though the result is obtained by a simple enumeration of terms from probability densities, its derivation highlights many connections with the Gibbs-type recursion in Eq. (1.1) that manifest themselves in the triangular array of integrals $g(n,k)$ for $n \geq k \geq 1$ and in the primitives $F^n_{\alpha,\Theta}(\cdot\,,\cdot)$. Recall that, for every $j \leq n$, we associate Z_j with the j-th customer in the Gibbs-type IBP and the atoms of the measures as the sampled dishes. We use this analogy throughout the proof.

Theorem A.1. *Let K_n be the number of distinct atoms among $Z_1, \ldots, Z_n$, denoted by $\{\omega_1, \ldots, \omega_{K_n}\}$. Then*

$$p(Z_1, \ldots, Z_n) = \gamma^{K_n} \exp\Bigl(-\gamma \sum_{j=1}^{n} F^{j-1}_{\alpha,\Theta}(1,1)\Bigr) \times \prod_{k=1}^{K_n} (1-\alpha)_{S_{n,k}-1} F^{n-S_{n,k}}_{\alpha,\Theta}(S_{n,k}, 1) B_0(\mathrm{d}\omega_k), \tag{A.1}$$

where $F^0_{\alpha,\Theta}(n,1) := (1-\alpha)_{n-1} V_{n,1}$ and $S_{n,k} := \sum_{j=1}^{n} Z_j\{\omega_k\}$, for every $k \leq K_n$.

Proof. The proof is by induction. For the case $n = 1$, we have

$$p(Z_1) = \frac{\gamma^{K_1}}{K_1!} e^{-\gamma} \times K_1! \prod_{k=1}^{K_1} B_0(\mathrm{d}\omega_k), \tag{A.2}$$

where the first term on the right hand side arises from a Poisson likelihood and the second term accounts for the joint distribution of the atoms $\{\omega_1, \ldots, \omega_{K_1}\}$. Note that this set is unordered, and a $K_1!$ term has therefore been included to account for the different possible (equally probable) labelings appearing in Eq. (A.2). Because $S_{1,1} = 1$ and $F^0_{\alpha,\Theta}(1,1) = 1$ (see Eq. (A.7) below for the motivation behind this proviso), we obtain Eq. (A.1) for $n = 1$.

Now consider when $n \geq 1$. A simple enumeration of probabilities shows that the conditional distribution of Z_{n+1}, given $Z_1, \ldots, Z_n$, is characterized by

$$\begin{aligned} &p(Z_{n+1} \mid Z_1, \ldots, Z_n) \\ &\quad = \frac{\gamma^{K^+_{n+1}}}{K^+_{n+1}!} \exp\Big(-\gamma F^n_{\alpha,\Theta}(1,1)\Big) \times K^+_{n+1}! \prod_{k=K_n+1}^{K_{n+1}} B_0(\mathrm{d}\omega_k) \\ &\qquad \times \prod_{\substack{\text{dish } k \leq K_n \\ \text{taken}}} (S_{n,k} - \alpha) F^n_{\alpha,\Theta}(1,0) B_0(\mathrm{d}\omega_k) \\ &\qquad \times \prod_{\substack{\text{dish } k \leq K_n \\ \text{not taken}}} \Big[1 - (S_{n,k} - \alpha) F^n_{\alpha,\Theta}(1,0)\Big] B_0(\mathrm{d}\omega_k), \end{aligned} \tag{A.3}$$

where K^+_{n+1} is the number of new features sampled by the $n+1$-st customer in the process, and $K_{n+1} := K_n + K^+_{n+1}$. Note that the final two product terms result from the decisions by the $n+1$-st customer to take or not to take dishes sampled by previous customers. By the inductive hypothesis, we need only multiply this expression by Eq. (A.1) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &p(Z_1, \ldots, Z_{n+1}) \\ &= \gamma^{K_{n+1}} \exp\Big(-\gamma \sum_{j=1}^{n+1} F^{j-1}_{\alpha,\Theta}(1,1)\Big) \times \prod_{k=1}^{K_{n+1}} B_0(\mathrm{d}\omega_k) \\ &\quad \times \prod_{\substack{\text{dish } k \leq K_n \\ \text{taken}}} (1-\alpha)_{S_{n,k}-1} \Big[(S_{n,k} - \alpha) F^n_{\alpha,\Theta}(1,0)\Big] F^{n-S_{n,k}}_{\alpha,\Theta}(S_{n,k}, 1) \\ &\quad \times \prod_{\substack{\text{dish } k \leq K_n \\ \text{not taken}}} (1-\alpha)_{S_{n,k}-1} \Big[1 - (S_{n,k} - \alpha) F^n_{\alpha,\Theta}(1,0)\Big] F^{n-S_{n,k}}_{\alpha,\Theta}(S_{n,k}, 1). \end{aligned} \tag{A.4}$$

In order to reduce this expression, we establish a few identities. Recall from Section 3.2 that $g(n,s) = \mathbb{P}\{N_{n,B_{n-s+1}} = s\}$ is the probability that, in the urn scheme, a new color is drawn on the $(n-s+1)$-st iteration, and then this color is drawn again $s-1$ times in a row. By taking the expectation of the conditional

probability in Eq. (3.14), we may obtain an expression for $g(n,s)$ as

$$g(n,s) = (1-\alpha)_{s-1} F_{\alpha,\Theta}^{n-s}(s,1), \qquad n \geq s \geq 1. \tag{A.5}$$

Care must be taken with the diagonal elements $g(n,n)$ for $n \geq 1$, however, as the quantity $F_{\alpha,\Theta}^{0}(n,1)$ is not well-defined by Eq. (1.2). To this end, note that $g(n,n) = \mathbb{P}\{N_{n,1} = n\}$ (c.f. Eq. (3.12)) is the probability that all balls drawn in the urn scheme are of the same color, given by

$$g(n,n) = \frac{V_{2,1}}{V_{1,1}}(1-\alpha)\frac{V_{3,1}}{V_{2,1}}(2-\alpha)\cdots\frac{V_{n,1}}{V_{n-1,1}}(n-1-\alpha) \tag{A.6}$$

$$= (1-\alpha)_{n-1} V_{n,1}. \tag{A.7}$$

This motivates our proviso to set $F_{\alpha,\Theta}^{0}(n,1) := (1-\alpha)_{n-1}V_{n,1}$, for all $n \geq 1$.

We now compare Eq. (A.5) with several alternative expressions. Recall from Eqs. (3.15) to (3.17) that

$$\frac{g(n+1,s+1)}{g(n,s)} = (s-\alpha)F_{\alpha,\Theta}^{n}(1,0), \qquad n \geq s \geq 1. \tag{A.8}$$

Therefore, by combining Eqs. (A.5) and (A.8), we obtain the identity

$$F_{\alpha,\Theta}^{n-s}(s+1,1) = F_{\alpha,\Theta}^{n-s}(s,1)F_{\alpha,\Theta}^{n}(1,0). \tag{A.9}$$

Also consider $g(n+1,s)$, which is the probability that a new color is drawn on the $(n-s+1)$-st iteration of the urn scheme, which is then drawn again $s-1$ times in a row (i.e., the probability $g(n,s)$), but then not drawn again on the $n+1$-st round. More formally,

$$g(n+1,s) = g(n,s) \times \mathbb{E}\Big[1 - (s-\alpha)\frac{V_{n+1,B_{n-s}}}{V_{n,B_{n-s}}}\Big] \tag{A.10}$$

$$= (1-\alpha)_{s-1} F_{\alpha,\Theta}^{n-s}(s,1)\Big[1 - (s-\alpha)F_{\alpha,\Theta}^{n}(1,0)\Big], \tag{A.11}$$

where the second term on the right hand side of Eq. (A.10) follows from Eq. (2.2). Then with Eqs. (A.5) and (A.11) we obtain the identity

$$F_{\alpha,\Theta}^{n+1-s}(s,1) = F_{\alpha,\Theta}^{n-s}(s,1)\Big[1 - (s-\alpha)F_{\alpha,\Theta}^{n}(1,0)\Big]. \tag{A.12}$$

With the identities in Eqs. (A.9) and (A.12), we may write Eq. (A.4) as

$$\begin{aligned} p(Z_1,\ldots,Z_{n+1}) = \gamma^{K_{n+1}} \exp\Big(-\gamma \sum_{j=1}^{n+1} F_{\alpha,\Theta}^{j-1}(1,1)\Big) \times \prod_{k=1}^{K_{n+1}} B_0(\mathrm{d}\omega_k) \\ \times \prod_{\substack{\text{dish } k \leq K_n \\ \text{taken}}} (1-\alpha)_{S_{n,k}} F_{\alpha,\Theta}^{n-S_{n,k}}(S_{n,k}+1,1) \\ \times \prod_{\substack{\text{dish } k \leq K_n \\ \text{not taken}}} (1-\alpha)_{S_{n,k}-1} F_{\alpha,\Theta}^{n+1-S_{n,k}}(S_{n,k},1). \end{aligned} \tag{A.13}$$

Finally, note that for each dish $k \leq K_n$ that customer $n+1$ takes, we have that $S_{n+1,k} = S_{n,k} + 1$, and for each of these dishes not taken, we have that $S_{n+1,k} = S_{n,k}$. Furthermore, for each new dish $k = K_n + 1, \ldots, K_{n+1}$ taken by the $n+1$-st customer, note that $S_{n+1,k} = 1$. It follows that

$$p(Z_1, \ldots, Z_{n+1}) = \gamma^{K_{n+1}} \exp\Big(-\gamma \sum_{j=1}^{n+1} F_{\alpha,\Theta}^{j-1}(1,1)\Big) \times \prod_{k=1}^{K_{n+1}} (1-\alpha)_{S_{n+1,k}-1} F_{\alpha,\Theta}^{n+1-S_{n+1,k}}(S_{n+1,k}, 1) B_0(\mathrm{d}\omega_k),$$

which matches Eq. (A.1) for $n+1$, as desired. □

Appendix B: Computational considerations

Simulating a Gibbs-type IBP and performing the posterior inference procedure described in Section 6 only requires the primitives $F_{\alpha,\Theta}^n(\,\cdot\,,\,\cdot\,)$ given by Eq. (1.2). In particular, when simulating a Gibbs-type IBP with n customers, we only need to compute the constants $F_{\alpha,\Theta}^j(1,0)$ and $F_{\alpha,\Theta}^j(1,1)$, for $j \leq n$. When performing posterior inference on the feature allocation, we only need the two constants $F_{\alpha,\Theta}^{n-1}(1,0)$ and $F_{\alpha,\Theta}^{n-1}(1,1)$ for a dataset of size n. In order to resample the discount parameter α and the Gibbs-type partition parameters Θ, we additionally require the n constants $F_{\alpha,\Theta}^{n-s}(s,1)$, for $1 \leq s \leq n$, and the $n-1$ constants $F_{\alpha,\Theta}^{j-1}(1,1)$, for $2 \leq j \leq n$. These constants may be computed and stored for given values of α and Θ, and need only be recomputed when these parameters are resampled.

Computing these primitives requires the lower triangular array of generalized factorial coefficients $\mathscr{C}(j,k;\alpha)$, for $n \geq j \geq k \geq 1$, given by Eq. (1.3), and we now discuss some practical issues that arise when computing these quantities. For a thorough treatment of the generalized factorial coefficients, and for derivations of the identities we use here, see the text by Charalambides [6]. Evaluating the explicit representation for $\mathscr{C}(j,k;\alpha)$ in Eq. (1.3) for all but small values of n is computationally infeasible. Instead, we may use either of the facts that $\mathscr{C}(j,j;\alpha) = \alpha^j$ or $\mathscr{C}(j+1,j+1;\alpha) = \alpha\mathscr{C}(j,j;\alpha)$, for $j \geq 1$, in order to fill out the diagonal elements of the array (costing $O(n)$ operations). Then with the provisos $\mathscr{C}(0,0;\alpha) = 1$ and $\mathscr{C}(j,0;\alpha) = 0$, for $j \geq 1$, along with the recursive relationship

$$\mathscr{C}(j+1,k;\alpha) = (j - \alpha k)\mathscr{C}(j,k;\alpha) + \alpha\mathscr{C}(j,k-1;\alpha), \tag{B.1}$$

we may fill out the remaining elements of the array. These numbers become rather large for even moderately sized n, so the log of these numbers should be computed and stored. This, however, prevents us from implementing models with $\alpha < 0$, and so the experiments in Section 7 are limited to the class of Gibbs-type IBPs with $\alpha \in [0,1)$.

Computing the primitives also requires the triangular array of Gibbs-type weights $V_{j,k}$, for $n \geq j \geq k \geq 1$. For the Pitman–Yor type IBP, the explicit expressions for the primitives $F^n_{\alpha,\Theta}(\,\cdot\,,\,\cdot\,)$ given by Eq. (1.6) allow one to completely avoid representing $\overrightarrow{V}$, as with the original treatment of this case by Teh and Görür [47]. For the normalized generalized gamma IBP (with parameters $\alpha \in (0,1)$ and $\beta > 0$), evaluating the explicit representation for $\overrightarrow{V}$ given by Eq. (2.5) is difficult in practice. However, following derivations due to Ho et al. [20], we may obtain random approximations to these weights that are straightforward to sample. In particular, note that the weights $\{V_{n,k}\}$ for the partitions induced by the normalized generalized gamma processes have the representation given by Eq. (2.6) (with $h(t) = e^{\beta^\alpha - \beta t}$), leading us to

$$V_{n,k} = \frac{\alpha^k}{\Gamma(n-k\alpha)} \int_0^\infty \int_0^1 \Big[p^{n-1-k\alpha} t^{-k\alpha} e^{\beta^\alpha - \beta t} f_\alpha(t(1-p)) \Big] \mathrm{d}p \, \mathrm{d}t \tag{B.2}$$

$$= \frac{\alpha^{k-1}\Gamma(k)}{\Gamma(n)} \int_0^\infty \Big[e^{\beta^\alpha - \beta t} \frac{\alpha\Gamma(n)}{\Gamma(k)\Gamma(n-k\alpha)} t^{-k\alpha} \times \Big(\int_0^1 (1-p)^{n-k\alpha-1} f_\alpha(tp) \Big) \Big] \mathrm{d}p \, \mathrm{d}t \tag{B.3}$$

$$= \frac{\alpha^{k-1}\Gamma(k)}{\Gamma(n)} \mathbb{E}\Big[\exp\Big\{ \beta^\alpha - \beta \frac{X}{Y} \Big\} \Big], \tag{B.4}$$

where f_α is the density function of a positive α-stable distribution, the random variable $Y \sim \mathrm{beta}(k\alpha, n-k\alpha)$, and

$$\mathbb{P}\{X \in \mathrm{d}x\} = \frac{\Gamma(k\alpha+1)}{\Gamma(k+1)} x^{k\alpha} f_\alpha(x) \mathrm{d}x. \tag{B.5}$$

That is, X is a polynomially tilted positive α-stable random variable. We may therefore sample values for $\overrightarrow{V}$ with a Markov chain Monte Carlo procedure, where we simulate many values of X and Y in order to approximate the expectation in Eq. (B.4). Simulating X may be done with the efficient sampler developed by Devroye [8, Sec. 5]. We may efficiently fill out the array of weights $\{V_{j,k} \colon n \geq j \geq k \geq 1\}$ by first filling out either the diagonal, the first column, or the final row of the array (costing $O(n)$ operations), and then filling out the remainder of the array with the recursion in Eq. (1.1). The weights $\{V_{j,k}\}$ in this case must therefore be treated as auxiliary random variables in the Gibbs sampler described in Section 6, and should be resampled during inference (which we note is already performed when new values of the hyperparameters α and β are sampled).

References

[1] P. De Blasi, S. Favaro, A. Lijoi, R. Mena, I. Prünster, and M. Ruggiero. Are Gibbs-type priors the most natural generalization of the Dirichlet process? *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 2014. Special issue on Bayesian nonparametrics.

[2] T. Broderick, M. I. Jordan, and J. Pitman. Beta processes, stick-breaking and power laws. *Bayesian Analysis*, 7(2):439–476, 2012.

[3] T. Broderick, J. Pitman, and M. I. Jordan. Feature allocations, probability functions, and paintboxes. *Bayesian Analysis*, 8(4):801–836, 2013.

[4] T. Broderick, L. Mackey, J. Paisley, and M. I. Jordan. Combinatorial clustering and the beta-negative binomial process. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 2014. Special issue on Bayesian nonparametrics.

[5] T. Broderick, A. C. Wilson, and M. I. Jordan. Posteriors, conjugacy, and exponential families for completely random measures. *arXiv preprint: 1410.6843 [math.ST] (version 1)*, 2014.

[6] C. A. Charalambides. *Combinatorial methods in discrete distributions*. John Wiley & Sons, 2005.

[7] A. Clauset, C. R. Shalizi, and M. E. J. Newman. Power-law distributions in empirical data. *SIAM review*, 51(4):661–703, 2009.

[8] L. Devroye. Random variate generation for exponentially and polynomially tilted stable distributions. *ACM Transactions on Modeling and Computer Simulation (TOMACS)*, 19(4), 2009.

[9] S. Favaro and S. G. Walker. Slice sampling σ-stable Poisson–Kingman mixture models. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, 22(4): 830–847, 2013.

[10] S. Favaro, A. Lijoi, and I. Prünster. Conditional formulae for Gibbs-type exchangeable random partitions. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 23(5): 1721–1754, 2013.

[11] S. Favaro, M. Lomeli, B. Nipoti, and Y. W. Teh. On the stick-breaking representation of σ-stable Poisson–Kingman models. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 8(1):1063–1085, 2014.

[12] Z. Ghahramani, T. L. Griffiths, and P. Sollich. Bayesian nonparametric latent feature models. *Bayesian Statistics*, 8:201–226, 2007. See also the discussion and rejoinder.

[13] A. Gnedin. A species sampling model with finitely many types. *Electronic Communications in Probability*, 15:79–88, 2010.

[14] A. Gnedin and J. Pitman. Exchangeable Gibbs partitions and Stirling triangles. *Journal of Mathematical Sciences*, 138(3):5674–5685, 2006.

[15] T. L. Griffiths and Z. Ghahramani. Infinite latent feature models and the Indian buffet process. Technical Report GCNU TR 2005-001, Gatsby Computational Neuroscience Unit, 2005.

[16] T. L. Griffiths and Z. Ghahramani. Infinite latent feature models and the Indian buffet process. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 19*, 2006.

[17] T. L. Griffiths and Z. Ghahramani. The Indian buffet process: An introduction and review. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 12:1185–1224, 2011.

[18] C. Heaukulani and D. M. Roy. The combinatorial structure of beta negative binomial processes. *Bernoulli, To appear.*, 2015.

[19] N. L. Hjort. Nonparametric Bayes estimators based on beta processes in

models for life history data. *The Annals of Statistics*, 18(3):1259–1294, 1990.

[20] M. Ho, L. F. James, and J. W. Lau. Gibbs partitions (EPPF's) derived from a stable subordinator are Fox H and Meijer G transforms. *arXiv Preprint: 0708.0619 [math.PR] (version 2)*, 2007.

[21] H. Ishwaran and L. F. James. Gibbs sampling methods for stick-breaking priors. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 96(453), 2001.

[22] L. F. James. Poisson latent feature calculus for generalized Indian buffet processes. *arXiv preprint: 1411.2936 [math.PR] (version 3)*, 2014.

[23] L. F. James, A. Lijoi, and I. Prünster. Posterior analysis for normalized random measures with independent increments. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics*, 36(1):76–97, 2009.

[24] L. F. James, P. Orbanz, and Y. W. Teh. Scaled subordinators and generalizations of the Indian buffet process. *arXiv preprint: 1510.07309 [math.PR] (version 1)*, 2015.

[25] Y. Kim. Nonparametric Bayesian estimators for counting processes. *The Annals of Statistics*, 27(2):562–588, 1999.

[26] J. F. C. Kingman. Completely random measures. *Pacific Journal of Mathematics*, 21(1):59–78, 1967.

[27] J. F. C. Kingman. Random discrete distributions. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series B*, 37(1):1–22, 1975.

[28] J. F. C. Kingman. The representation of partition structures. *Journal of the London Mathematical Society*, 2(2):374–380, 1978.

[29] R. M. Korwar and M. Hollander. Contributions to the theory of Dirichlet processes. *The Annals of Probability*, 1(4):705–711, 1973.

[30] A. Lijoi, R. H. Mena, and I. Prünster. Hierarchical mixture modeling with normalized inverse-Gaussian priors. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 100(472):1278–1291, 2005.

[31] A. Lijoi, R. H. Mena, and I. Prünster. Controlling the reinforcement in Bayesian non-parametric mixture models. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series B*, 69(4):715–740, 2007.

[32] A. Lijoi, I. Prünster, and S. G. Walker. Investigating nonparametric priors with Gibbs structure. *Statistica Sinica*, 18(4):1653–1668, 2008.

[33] E. Meeds, Z. Ghahramani, R. M. Neal, and S. T. Roweis. Modeling dyadic data with binary latent factors. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 20*, 2007.

[34] R. M. Neal. Slice sampling. *The Annals of Statistics*, 31(3):705–741, 2003.

[35] J. Paisley, A. Zaas, C. W. Woods, G. S. Ginsburg, and L. Carin. A stick-breaking construction of the beta process. In *Proceedings of the 27th International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2010.

[36] J. Paisley, L. Carin, and D. M. Blei. Variational inference for stick-breaking beta process priors. In *Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2011.

[37] J. Paisley, D. M. Blei, and M. I. Jordan. Stick-breaking beta processes and the Poisson process. In *Proceedings of the 15th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, 2012.

[38] M. Perman, J. Pitman, and M. Yor. Size-biased sampling of Poisson point processes and excursions. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 92(1): 21–39, 1992.

[39] J. Pitman. Exchangeable and partially exchangeable random partitions. *Probability theory and related fields*, 102(2):145–158, 1995.

[40] J. Pitman. *Combinatorial stochastic processes*. Springer, 2002. Presented as a lecture course at the 32nd Summer School on Probability Theory held in Saint-Flour, July 2002. Available online.

[41] J. Pitman. Poisson–Kingman partitions. In *Statistics and science: a Festschrift for Terry Speed*, pages 1–34. Institute of Mathematical Statistics, 2003.

[42] J. Pitman and M. Yor. The two-parameter Poisson–Dirichlet distribution derived from a stable subordinator. *The Annals of Probability*, 25(2):855–900, 1997.

[43] E. Regazzini, A. Lijoi, and I. Prünster. Distributional results for means of normalized random measures with independent increments. *The Annals of Statistics*, 31(2):560–585, 2003.

[44] Daniel M. Roy. The continuum-of-urns scheme, generalized beta and Indian buffet processes, and hierarchies thereof. *arXiv Preprint: 1501.00208 [math.PR] (version 1)*, 2014.

[45] J. Sethuraman. A constructive definition of Dirichlet priors. *Statistica Sinica*, 4:639–650, 1994.

[46] Y. W. Teh. A hierarchical bayesian language model based on Pitman–Yor processes. In *Proceedings of the 21st International Conference on Computational Linguistics and the 44th annual meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 2006.

[47] Y. W. Teh and D. Görür. Indian buffet processes with power-law behavior. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 22*, 2009.

[48] Y. W. Teh, D. Görür, and Z. Ghahramani. Stick-breaking construction for the Indian buffet process. In *Proceedings of the 11th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, 2007.

[49] R. Thibaux and M. I. Jordan. Hierarchical beta processes and the Indian buffet process. In *Proceedings of the 11th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, 2007.

[50] M. Zhou, L. Hannah, D. Dunson, and L. Carin. Beta-negative binomial process and Poisson factor analysis. In *Proceedings of the 15th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, 2012.